



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,103	01/27/2004	Willie W. Ng	B-4585 619759-6	2200

7590 02/15/2007  
Richard P. Berg, ESQ.  
c/o LADAS & PARRY  
Suite 2100  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679

EXAMINER
----------

VAN ROY, TOD THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2828

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/15/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/766,103

Applicant(s)

NG ET AL.

Examiner

Tod T. Van Roy

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-17 and 19-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-17,19-23 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/12/2006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/17/2006 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The examiner agrees that all previous USC 112 rejections were made improperly and are hereby withdrawn.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 11/17/2006, with respect to the rejections over Soref have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of the claims has been withdrawn.

The examiner agrees that Soref does not properly motivate the use of silicon waveguides and substrate.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

The indicated allowability of claim 26 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Orenstein. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 5-10, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orenstein et al. (US 6940878) in view of Yamada et al. (US 6027254).

With respect to claim 1, Orenstein teaches (fig.3a), a reconfigurable laser transmitter comprising: an integration platform having a substrate (fig.3a), a gain element (col.3 lines 36-37) having an optical output, the gain element having a body of

Art Unit: 2828

material different from said integrating platform (active layer would inherently be a different body of material in order to lase), being disposed on said integration platform, a first optical path (fig.3a laser WG) receiving optical output from said gain element, said first optical path comprising a waveguide (laser WG) within said integration platform, a tunable microresonator (fig.3a A) optically coupled with said first optical path, a second optical path coupled with said tunable microresonator, said second optical path comprising a waveguide (fig.3a upper), and a fixed grating (fig.3a B) in said integration platform (col.5 lines 4-5, on waveguide so in platform) and coupled with said second optical path. Orenstein does not teach the waveguides and substrate to be of silicon material. Yamada teaches a gain medium integrated onto a silicon substrate and using silicon waveguides (fig.9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the substrate and waveguide material of Yamada with the transmitter of Orenstein in order to allow for heat dissipation through the substrate (Yamada, col.1 lines 40-52), as well as to use silicon waveguides as this well known waveguiding material (optical fibers) is a low loss transmitter of a plurality of wavelengths which would function well in Orenstein's tunable system.

With respect to claim 5, silicon inherently has a temperature sensitivity of less than  $0.1\text{A/C}$  (approx.  $0.01\text{A/C}$ , see Conradi US 6061369).

With respect to claims 6-7, Orenstein teaches electrical (Vernier) tuning (col.3 lines 60-63).

With respect to claim 8, Orenstein teaches the use of a sampled grating (col.3 lines 45-48).

With respect to claim 9, Orenstein teaches the gain element is a laser and the grating is used for locking the laser thereto (col.1 lines 31-37).

With respect to claim 10, Orenstein and Yamada teach the transmitter as outlined in the rejection of claims 1 and 9 above, and Orenstein additionally teaches the microresonator is mounted on the integration platform.

*With respect to the UV-induced limitation found in claim 10, these limitations merely detail the methods of forming the device. The method of forming a device is not germane to the patentability of the device itself, therefore these limitations are not given patentable weight. At best these claims could be characterized as product-by-process claims, where the process limitations are not limiting, only the structure implied by the process. See MPEP 2113. Here, the structure implied by the process steps is merely the structure of claim 10.*

Claims 13-16 are rejected for the same reasons outlined in the rejections to claims 6, 5, 8, and 7 respectively.

Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orenstein, Yamada, and further in view of Soref (US 6195187).

With respect to claims 3 and 11, Orenstein and Yamada teach the transmitter outlined in the rejections to claims 1 and 10 below, but do not teach the use of a microdisk. Soref teaches a coupling device (between two waveguides) which uses a microdisk. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2828

invention to replace the microring of Orenstein and Yamada with the microdisk of Soref in order to obtain a more favorable contact geometry (Soref, col.5 lines 60-64).

Claims 17, 19-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orenstein, Yamada, Soref, and further in view of Tanaka et al. (US 6320888).

With respect to claim 17, Orenstein, Yamada, and Soref teach the transmitter outlined in the rejections to claims 1, 3, and 6 above, but do not teach the grating to be formed in the waveguide. Tanaka teaches a gain medium and silicon waveguide integrated on a silicon substrate (fig.1) wherein the grating is written directly unto the waveguide. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the transmitter and separated waveguide/grating of Orenstein, Yamada, and Soref with the combined waveguide/grating of Tanaka in order to reduce the amount of loss due to evanescent coupling when using an external grating.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7 above.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9 above.

*With respect to the UV-induced limitation found in claim 21, these limitations merely detail the methods of forming the device. The method of forming a device is not germane to the patentability of the device itself, therefore these limitations are not given patentable weight. At best these claims could be characterized as product-by-process claims, where the process limitations are not limiting, only the structure implied by the*

Art Unit: 2828

*process. See MPEP 2113. Here, the structure implied by the process steps is merely the structure of claim 17.*

With respect to claim 22, Orenstein further teaches the step of coupling a fixed optical resonator filter (B) to said tunable microresonator (A) (see figs.4a/b).

With respect to claim 23, Orenstein further teaches emitting light at 1.55um (col.3 lines 29-42, an international standard for silicon waveguides (fibers)).

With respect to claim 26, Orenstein further teaches forming another waveguide in the integration platform (either WG or upper). Orenstein does not teach the microresonator to be of III-V materials. These materials are known in the art to be used with semiconductor lasers and resonators. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the resonator of these known materials, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960).

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tod T. Van Roy whose telephone number is (571)272-8447. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F:




Art Unit: 2828

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minsun Harvey can be reached on (571)272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TVR

  
**MINSUN OH HARVEY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**